OPEN PEER REVIEW

Open Peer Review (OPR)

As a new feature for progressing towards transparency, we decided to open a new window for all of our editors as well as authors titled "**Peer Review**". We hope by this new facility, our reviewers will be more motivated and authors will be more satisfied with the review process. We believe that publishing our peer review reports could make a transparent and clear environment for all our efforts within a journal, but not all reviewers tend to publish their comments.

What is "Open Peer Review" process?

An "Open Peer Review" process is making the details of all review process (including reviewers, associate editors, and EICs comments) as "Public" as it is agreed by EIC, Authors, and reviewers.

Advantages of "Open Peer Review" process

- More transparency, constructiveness and tactful comments of the peer review process: leads to an increase in the quality of reviews
- More motivations for all involved roles in the review process
- Authors' satisfactions from the review process: Increases honesty between authors and reviewers
- Education of both authors and new students
- Prevents reviewers from following their individual agendas and leading to the detection of reviewers' conflicts of interests

You can find out more at:

Peer Review

Journal of Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences
Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.5812/jkums-121880
Published in: Journal of Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences: 26(1) ; e121880

Peer Review Report for "The Supportive Care Needs of Breast Cancer Patients and Its Related Factors: A Cross-sectional Study"

Author(s): Hassan Okati-Aliabad, Shiva Kargar, Alireza Ansari Moghaddam, Mahdi Mohammadi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	12 Dec 2021
Revised Date:	17 Apr 2022
Accepted Date:	17 Apr 2022

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

Dear Editor,

Thank you for allowing me to submit a revised draft of my manuscript titled " **The Supportive Care Needs of breast cancer patients and its related factors: a cross sectional study**" to the **Journal of Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences.**

I appreciate the time and effort you and the reviewers have dedicated to providing your valuable feedback on my manuscript. I am grateful to the reviewers for their insightful comments on my paper. I have carefully reviewed the comments and have revised the manuscript accordingly. I have highlighted the changes within the manuscript in yellow. Here is a point-by-point response to the reviewer's comments and concerns. I hope the revised version is now suitable for publication and look forward to hearing from you in due course.

Sincerely,

Shiva Kargar

Response to respected Reviewer 1:

1- Please edit all of the text for typo and grammatical errors. there were many long sentences. (Abstract,

Response1:

This case was corrected.

Abstract:

2- Please reduce the abstract words count under the 230 words.

Response 2:

This was corrected and reduced to less than 250 words based on the format of the journal.

3- Please use the p-value in result section for relations

Response 3:

This case was corrected and marked in yellow (page 2, line 45, 46).

4- keywords: Why did you use the "illness adjustment"?

Response 4:

This word means adaptation to the disease. Also, the same term "illness adjustment" has been used in the questionnaire designed to measure this case.

5- Please check the keywords via PUBMED MeSH terms in term of typo graphical errors

Response 5:

This case was cheked.

Introduction:
6- The introduction is very short. please add and explain more about the 1- prevalence of breast cancer in world, middle east, and iran 2- burden of the breast cancer in world and iran 3- common cares in world and iran 4- costs of cares in world and iran , and 5- the role of supportive cares in reduce the burden of breast cancer in patients that reported in previous studies.

Response 6:

This case was corrected and marked in yellow (page 3, line 6 to 75).

Method:

7- The reference 10 is not related to the reliability and validity of SCNS-SF34. please explain why you choose this ref?

Response 7:

In this study, the Persian version of this questionnaire has been measured in terms of validity and reliability.

Result:

8- Nearly 90% had a lower than high school education level. Lower than what?

Response 8:

This case was corrected and marked in yellow (page 6, line 160).

9- It seems that there is a wrong in some of the reported means that the SD is big for this mean. example: 35.37 ± 21.97, 18.07 ± 15.21m 33.50±21.96. who it is possible that SD is bigger than the mean? (17.77±31.69). Please consult a statistician and explain

Response 9:

انحراف معیار پراکندگی داده ها در اطراف میانگین را نشان میدهد. و در این مطالعه بزرگی انحراف معیار نشان دهنده پراکندگی زیاد می باشد و از نظر آماری امکان بزرگ تر شدن انحراف معیار از میانگین وجود دارد.

Response to respected Associate Editor 1:

1-عنوان:

The Supportive Care Needs of breast cancer patients and its related factors in patients with breast cancer: a cross sectional stud

2. چکیده فارسي و انگلیسي توضیح: چکیده حاوی قسمت های زمینه، روش ها، یافته ها و نتیجه گیری و حداکثر 250 کلمه می باشد. قسمت زمینه، فقط حاوی هدف است.

پاسخ2:

- ✓ تعداد کلمات چکیده به 248 کلمه کاهش داده شد.
- ✓ توضیحات در قسمت زمینه اضافه گردید.

3.کلیدواژه‌ها:مناسب است.

4. مقدمه:

نتیجه مطالعات قبلی بیان شود .

دلایل انجام مطالعه مشخص نیست.

پاسخ 4:

- ✓ اصلاحات انجام شد و به نتیج مطالعات قبا و دلایل پژوهش اشاره گردید (صفحه : 4 خط: 93تا 99).

5. مواد و روشها :

ناقص بیان شده است. به ترتیب به موارد زیر اشاره شود.

طراحی مطالعه، نمونه ها و روش نمونه گیری، ابزار جمع آوری داده ها، روش جمع آوری داده ها، روش تحلیل داده ها، و ملاحظات اخلاقی

- در قسمت "نمونه ها و روش نمونه گیری" حجم نمونه اشاره شود. چرا مقطع شش ماهه برای نمونه گیری انجام شده است چرا حجم نمونه محاسبه نشده است؟

- ✓ ما در این مطالعه بصورت سرشماری ، کلیه زنان مبتلابه سرطان پستان را وارد مطالعه کردیم.
- ✓ در قسمت method توضیح داده شد وبا رنگ زرد هایلات شده است (صفحه : 4 خط: 103 -108).

- در قسسمت "ابزار جمع آوری داده ها" به نام طراح با ذکر رفرنس اشاره شود. در مورد تمام ابزارها(ابزارهای خارجی) به پایایی و روایی نسخه انگلیسی و فارسی اشاره شود. نحوه امتیازدهی، تمام ابزارها اشاره شود. به فرم اطلاعات فردی نیز اشاره شود.

پاسخ:

- ✓ در قسمت method به موارد خواسته شده اشاره گردید وبا رنگ زرد هایلات شده است (صفحه : 5 خط: 111).

- روش جمع آوری داده ها بیان شود.

پاسخ:

- ✓ در قسمت method توضیح داده شد وبا رنگ زرد هایلات شده است (صفحه : 4 خط: 114).

- روش تحلیل داده ها، دلیل استفاده از آزمونهای ناپارامتری بیان شود.

پاسخ:

- ✓ درقسمت Statistical analysis توضیح داده شد وبا رنگ زرد هایلات شده است (صفحه : 5 خط: 151).

پاسخ:

- ملاحظات اخلاقی بیان شود.

- ✓ در قسمت" **Ethical considerations and consent to participate**" به ملاحضات اخلاقی اشاره شده است(صفحه : 12 خط: 290).

6- یافته ها :

در نتایج، ابتدا میزان نیازهای مراقبتی حمایتی، بیان شود. در عنوان جدول 4، به کیفیت زندگی نیز اشاره شده است که در قسمت ابزارها مورد اشاره قرار نگرفته است. به نظر میرسد این جدول، ارتباطی با اهداف مطالعه ندارد.

پاسخ6:

- ✓ اصلاحات انجام شد .

7- بحث:

بسیار ضعیف است. از منابع بسیار محدود استفاده شده است و یافته ها با نتایج مطالعات قبلی مقایسه نشده اند. تحلیل نویسنده نیز بیان نشده است.

به محدودیتهای مطالعه اشاره نشده است.

پاسخ7:

- ✓ قسمت بحث مقاله بسط داده شد و با رنگ زرد هایلات شده است.
- ✓ به محدودیت مطالعه اشاره شد (صفحه: 11و12 خط: 270)

8- نتیجه گیري :

بازنگری اساسی نیاز دارد به یافته های مطالعه اشاره شود و کاربرد نتایج بیان شود. برای مطالعات آتی پیشنهاد ذکر شود.

پاسخ8:

- ✓ اصلاحات انجام شد (صفحه : 12 خط: 276)

9- منابع: عمدتا قدیمی هستند . متن انگلیسی نیاز ویرایش دارد. اکثر حملات با کلمه we شروع میشوند. پیشنهاد میشود از عبارت مجهول استفاده شود (انجام شد، جمع آوری گردید،...)

پاسخ 9:

- ✓ اصلاحات انجام شد و از منابع جدید استفاده گردید.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

Dear Editor,

Thank you for allowing me to submit a revised draft of my manuscript titled " **The Supportive Care Needs of breast cancer patients and its related factors: a cross sectional study**" to the **Journal of Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences.**

I appreciate the time and effort you and the reviewers have dedicated to providing your valuable feedback on my manuscript. I am grateful to the reviewers for their insightful comments on my paper. I have carefully reviewed the comments and have revised the manuscript accordingly. I have highlighted the changes within the manuscript in yellow. Here is a point-by-point response to the reviewer's comments and concerns. I hope the revised version is now suitable for publication and look forward to hearing from you in due course.

Sincerely,

Shiva Kargar

Response to respected Reviewer 1:

1- Please reduce the word counts. Maximum word counts for original article is 3500.

Response1:

The word count of this manuscript without tables is 2744, which is less than 3500 words.

2- The “illness adjustment” is not Mesh. Please replace with emotional adjustment or remove it.

Response 2:

This was corrected and was replaced with emotional adjustment (page 2, line 54).

3-About ref 17 for reliability and validity of the SCNS-SF34: It is ok that the referenced article had measured the reli .. and vali … but it is better to use of the appropriate study. Overall, it is ok.

Response 3:

Thanks for your great comment.

4- Nearly 90% of patients had a less than high school education level ???? less than??. Please

change to:
Nearly 90% of patients had a pre-high school education level.

Response 4:

This case was corrected and marked in yellow (page 6, line 161).

5- Please remove the code availability. If you want to say about grant number you should state in acknowledgement section.

Response 5:

This case was corrected and was remove the code.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

Dear Editor,

Thank you for allowing me to submit a revised draft of my manuscript titled " **The Supportive Care Needs of breast cancer patients and its related factors: a cross sectional study**" to the **Journal of Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences.**

I appreciate the time and effort you and the reviewers have dedicated to providing your valuable feedback on my manuscript. I am grateful to the reviewers for their insightful comments on my paper. I have carefully reviewed the comments and have revised the manuscript accordingly. I have highlighted the changes within the manuscript in yellow. Here is a point-by-point response to the reviewer's comments and concerns. I hope the revised version is now suitable for publication and look forward to hearing from you in due course.

Sincerely,

Response to respected Reviewer 1:

1- The word count should be less than 3500 words with tables and references. Please edit based on that

Response1:

The word count of this manuscript has been reduced to 3,500.

2- About the last comment: In scientific articles, we do not have a header called code availability. Please delete this headline. As I said before, you should mention the grant number of your research in the Acknowledgement section. Also, please mention the ethical code of the article in the Ethical approval section.

Response 2:

corrections were made.

Ethics code added(page 9, line 208).

Ethical approval

The study was accepted by the ethics committee of Zahedan University of Medical Sciences (ethics code: IR.ZAUMS.REC.1399.010) .

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)